## Case 3:15-mj-71548-MRGD Document 12 Filed 01/11/16 Page 1 of 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

United States of America,	Case No. OR 3:15 MJ · 715485K-7
Plaintiff,  v.	STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL FICE L E D
· Wen Bing Lei	JAN 112016
Defendant.	SUSAN Y. SOONG CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
For the reasons stated by the parties on the record on	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA Lowery 1, 2016, the Court excludes time under the Lowery 1, 2016 and finds that the ends of justice served
Speedy Trial Act from <u>James 1 (</u> , 2016 to <u>Fa</u> by the continuance outweigh the best interest of the part of the p	oublic and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. §
Failure to grant a continuance would be See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).	be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice.
defendants, the nature of the property or law, that it is unreasonable to expense.	due to [check applicable reasons] the number of rosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial d by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).
Failure to grant a continuance would on taking into account the exercise of due	deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, e diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
Failure to grant a continuance would counsel's other scheduled case comm See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).	unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given itments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.
Failure to grant a continuance would necessary for effective preparation, ta See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).	unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time king into account the exercise of due diligence.
ALL TO CO ODDEDED	
IT IS SO ORDERED.	
DATED: 1/11//6	JOSEPH C. SPERØ
	United States Chief Magistrate Judge
STIPULATED:	Animal VI in 1 State Att
Attorney for Defendant	Assistant United States Attorney